AN

ANSWER

To a Late

Printed Paper,

Given about by ſome of the

CHURCH

OF

ROME.

In a LETTER to a GENTLEMAN.

The Third Edition.

Imprimatur. *April* 8. 1686.

Rev. 2. 5. *Remember from whence thou art faln, and repent, and doe the firſt works, or elſe I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy Candleſtick out of his place, except thou repent.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Walter Kettilby*, at the Biſhop's Head in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVIII.

THE
Popiſh Paper.

IT will not be denied but that the Church of *Rome* was once a moſt pure, excellent, flouriſhing and Mother * Church.

*Rom. 1. 8. Rom. 16. Rom. 6. *White*, defence of his Way. p. 435. King *Jam.* in his Speech to the Parliament. *Whitaker* in his Anſwer to D. *Sand.* 2 Demonſt. *Fulk* in c. 22 Theſ. Sect. 7. *Reynolds* in his 5th. Concluſion.

This Church could not ceaſe to be ſuch, but ſhe muſt fall either by Apoſtaſie, Hereſie or Schiſm.

I. Apoſtaſie is not onely a renouncing of the Faith of Chriſt, but the very Name and Title to Chriſtianity: No Man will ſay, that the Church of *Rome* had ever ſuch a fall, or fell thus.

II. Hereſie is an adheſion to ſome private and ſingular Opinion, or Errour in Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Church.

If the Church of *Rome* did ever adhere to any ſingular or new Opinion, diſagreeable to the common received Doctrine of the Chriſtian World, *I* pray ſatisfie me as to theſe particulars, *viz.*

1. By what General Council was ſhe ever condemned?
2. Which of the Fathers ever writ againſt her? Or,
3. By what Authority was ſhe otherwiſe reproved? For, It ſeems to me a thing very incongruous, that ſo great a Church ſhould be condemned by every one that hath a mind to condemn her.

III. Schiſm is a departure or diviſion from the Unity of the Church, whereby the Band and Communion held with ſome former Church, is broken and diſſolved.

If ever the Church of *Rome* divided her ſelf by Schiſm from any other Body of faithful Chriſtians, or brake Communion, or went forth from the Society of any Elder Church: *I* pray ſatisfie me as to theſe particulars.

1. Whoſe Company did ſhe leave?
2. From what Body did ſhe go forth?
3. Where was the true Church which ſhe forſook?

For it appears a little ſtrange to me, that a Church ſhould be accounted Schiſmatical, when there cannot be aſſigned any other Church different from her, (which from Age to Age, ſince Chriſt his time, hath continued viſible,) from whence ſhe departed.

To

To my honoured Friend, Mr. S. B.

SIR,

I Had no ſooner peruſed the Paper which I received from you, but I perceived that it was penn'd for the ſake of ſuch, as either are not well acquainted with the matters of Controverſie betwixt Us and the Church of *Rome*, or with the Way and Method of arguing. To ſuch as theſe they are wont to pretend high: To thoſe that are ignorant of the former, they talk of Antiquity and Univerſality; and to ſuch as are unskilful in the latter, of Demonſtrations, and ſelf-evident Principles, of Axioms and Definitions. But all this is a mere flouriſh of Words; for if theſe things come ſtrictly to be examined, inſtead of Antiquity, we ſhall too frequently find Forgery and Impoſture; inſtead of the *Catholick* Church, the Church of *Rome*; inſtead of Demonſtrations and Definitions, Sophiſtry and Fallacious Arguments. And after this ſtrain is this Paper wrote, in which things are ſo artificially mingled, that they look very ſpeciouſly to thoſe that do not underſtand them; and are ſo well fitted to work upon the eaſie, the ignorant, and inconſiderate, that after it had been printed, as I perceive, long ſince in *Fiat Lux*, it is again ſingled out, to be put into the Hands of ſuch as they have a deſign upon. But I ſhall endeavour to unravel it, and hope, by that time that I have done, that what is therein ſaid will appear to be wholly inſufficient to juſtifie their Church, and acquit it of thoſe Crimes it is charged with: And this I ſhall doe by ſhewing,

First, That the whole is false.

Secondly, That the particulars are very fallacious.

The former I shall make good by these following Considerations:

I. That a Church may fall from what it once was.

II. That the Church of *Rome* is not now what it was in Apostolical and Primitive times; when it might most of all pretend to be (as he calls it) *a most pure, excellent, and flourishing Church.*

III. That the alteration from what it was then, to what it is now, is to the worse; and that it is thereby intolerably corrupted.

If these Propositions be proved, then the way taken by our Authour will signifie nothing; since it will not be worth the while to enquire how it is, whether it be fallen by Apostasie, Heresie, or Schism, when it is demonstrable that so it is, that it is fallen.

I. That a Church may fall from what it once was; that is, from its primitive Purity and Simplicity in Faith and Manners, is evident to any that will read the Scriptures, and mind what is therein said of the Churches of the *Jews*, *Sardis* and *Laodicea*; or that are acquainted with Ecclesiastical History. And this they of the Church of *Rome* are bound to grant; who must acknowledge, according to their own Principles, that we once were a Church, when in their Communion; and that call us Apostatical, Heretical, and what not, since we have forsaken it.

II. That the Church of *Rome* is not now what it was in Apostolical and Primitive times, but is changed in Principles and Practice.

First, In Principles, as,

1. That the Pope is Christ's Vicar; that is, that he is the Universal Pastor over Christ's Flock, and hath a Jurisdiction over all Churches whatsoever, is a new Principle.

ple. This the Scripture (which the Church of *Rome* of old uſed to appeal to) is ſo far from giving any Countenance to, that our Saviour expreſly cautions the Apoſtles againſt any ſuch Uſurpation. Luke 22. 25. *When there was a ſtrife among them, which of them ſhould be accounted the greateſt; he ſaid unto them, The Kings of the* Gentiles *exerciſe Lordſhip over them*, &c. *but it ſhall not be ſo: but he that is the greateſt* [*or will be great*, Mark 10. 43.] *among you, let him be as the younger*, &c and in the 30. *v.* ſaith, *ye ſhall ſit upon twelve Thrones*, &c. not preferring one before the other. And leſt what he had occaſionally ſpoke to *Peter*, Mat. 16. 19. *Whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven*, &c. ſhould be miſconſtrued, he doth give the ſame power to the reſt of the Apoſtles, both before his Death, *Mat.* 18. 18. and alſo after his Reſurrection, *Joh.* 20. 23. And if we would underſtand the ſenſe of Antiquity, as to this matter, I know no ſurer nor ſhorter way, than to ſee what is ſaid by the Councils; for then the Fathers may be ſuppoſed to ſpeak moſt impartially and with greateſt authority; and of this I ſhall give you a brief Account. The firſt general Council was that of *Nice*, called by *Conſtantine* the Great, and held *An.* 325. which in the ſixth Canon doth thus decree, *That the Biſhop of* Alexandria, *and accordingly of* Antioch, *and of other Provinces, ſhould have power over their own Provinces, according to ancient Cuſtome, and the Cuſtome in that caſe of the Church of* Rome; *and that none ſhould invade the Privileges of each other.* The ſame is ſaid and confirmed in the ſecond Canon of the ſecond general Council held at *Conſtantinople* by the command of *Theodoſius* the Emperour, *An.* 380. And farther ratified by the third general Council at *Epheſus*, in the Year 431. *Can.* 8.

If we go forward, we ſhall find that it was farther decreed in the aboveſaid Council of *Conſtantinople*, *Can.* 3. *That the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *ſhould have the order*

of

of Primacy next to the Bishop of Rome, *because it is New* Rome. And what is thereby to be understood, is sufficiently declared in the 28th. Canon of the Fourth General Council assembled at *Chalcedon*, *An.* 451. in which it is decreed, *That the Church of* Constantinople *should have equal Privileges with that of* Rome, *there being the same Reason for that as the other, as it was the Imperial Seat:* and accordingly is there a particular Instance given in case of Appeals, *Can.* 9. From this Jurisdiction which every Church had over its own Members, proceeded other Canons: as, *That those who were excluded the Communion of one Church, should not be received by another*; so *Can.* 5. of the aforesaid Council of *Nice*. *That no Appeals should be made to foreign or transmarine Churches*; so the Council held at *Milevis* in *Africa*, (where S. *Augustine* was present,) *An.* 416. *Can.* 22. which Canon ‖ *Bellarmine* confesseth was made with a particular respect to *Rome*. To the same purpose the sixth Council held at *Carthage*, *An.* 420. (in which also S. *Augustine* was) passed a Decree *. From all which you may observe, 1. That the Bishop of *Rome* had anciently a limited Jurisdiction, it was over his own Province onely. 2. That the Jurisdiction which he had over his own Province was such as all other Supreme Bishops had over theirs. 3. That none had a power to transgress the ancient and settled bounds of Jurisdiction, or to invade those of anothers. 4. That the Honour given to the Bishop of *Rome* (whatever priority it was that he had) was not by any Divine Authority, but as *Rome* was the Imperial Seat. 5. That the Honour and Privilege which it had by that means, was what another was capable of; for the same was given to *Constantinople*. 6. That none of these Decrees in those General Councils were ever opposed by the Church of *Rome*, 'till the Council of *Chalcedon*. 7. That at that time the pretences of the Pope's Legates were universally opposed and rejected. And I may add, 8. That

‖ *L.* 2. *de Rom. Pon. cap.* 24.

* *Can.* 31.

8. That what was at any time in thoſe days claimed by the Church of *Rome*, was claimed not upon any Divine Authority, but onely upon the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, (as it appears from the tranſactions in the aforecited Council of *Carthage.)* 9. What was then claimed under that pretext, was upon a pretended, if not a forged, Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which was detected ſo to be by that Council of *Carthage*, and their Uſurpation rejected, as is evident from the Acts of that Council, and the Epiſtle written by the Fathers there aſſembled, to Pope *Celeſtine* upon it.

From all which it appears (and more I could ſhew) that there was no ſuch thing originally, as this Univerſal Paſtorſhip, which the Biſhop of *Rome* doth now challenge, and that *Rome* is therein changed from what it was.

And now let our Authour ask (if he pleaſe) *by what Councils was the Church of* Rome *ever condemned?* And you may anſwer, by the four firſt general Councils. Let him ask again, *Which of the Fathers ever wrote againſt her?* And you may anſwer, no leſs than 1068. for ſo many were then convened in all theſe four Councils. And if this ſuffice not, we may turn him to the Councils of *Milevis* and *Carthage* before-mentioned, and to others alſo of good Authority, beſides particular Fathers. I have been the longer upon this, not onely becauſe it could not be well compriſed in leſs, but alſo becauſe if this Claim of theirs fall, their Cauſe muſt fall with it.

2. Another new Principle of theirs is, That the Pope hath at leaſt, *in ordine ad Spiritualia*, a Power over all Kingdoms within the Church, and of depoſing Kings in caſe of Hereſie, or Obſtinacy, *&c.* and of abſolving Subjects from their Allegiance to them when thus depoſed. That this is the Principle of their Church is plain from *Can.* 3. of the Fourth Council of *Lateran*, and from the Council of *Trent*, in *Seſſ.* 25. *de reform. c.* 19. where it is

is somewhat covertly expressed, for a Reason which the state of Affairs at that time made necessary. That this is the Doctrine of their Church, is proved beyond all contradiction, by the present Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*, in his late Learned Treatise *Of Popery*, &c.

But that this Doctrine of theirs is *new*, is commonly confessed among themselves, and maintained so to be by several of their own Communion, and which any one may so far receive satisfaction in, from what is written by *Roger Widdrington (aliàs Preston)* in his *Apologia pro Jure Principum*, and his *Humillima Supplicatio ad Paulum Quintum.*

3. Transubstantiation was not originally an Article of their Creed, as it is now. So it is said by *Jo. Tribarn*, * an approved Authour of theirs, *In primitiva Ecclesia de substantia fidei erat*, &c. *It was of the substance of Faith in the primitive Church, to believe that the Body of Christ was contained under the* species *of Bread and Wine; but it was not of Faith, that the substance of the Bread should be turned into the Body of Christ, and upon Consecration should not be Bread. For,* saith he, *this was not found out by the Church till the time of* Innocent *the Third, in the Council of* Lateran, *where many Truths that before lay hid are explained in the Chap. of* Firmiter Credimus, *amongst which this of Transubstantiation is the chief.* So also saith *Peter Tataret* ‖. And this was the Opinion of *Scotus* *, the great Schoolman.

Now it is supposed that *Scotus*, who lived within 150 Years after, must better understand what was the Doctrine of their Church before it, and what was the sense of that Council concerning it, than he that comes about 450 Years after, and chides him for so doing, with a *minime probandum* ‖.

4. The Doctrine of Infallibility, respecting their Church as the Seat of it, was not anciently known, neither claimed by themselves, nor granted by others. Amongst

*Comment. in 4. Sent. Scoti, l. 4. Dist. 11. Q. 3. disp. 42. Sect. 1.

‖ Com. in 4. Sent. p. 301. col. 1. Ven. 1607. and p. 142. col. 1.

* In 4 Sent. dist. 11. q. 3. SS. ad argument. pro primam & dist. 10. q. 1. SS. quantum ergo.

‖ Bellarmin l. 3. de Euchar. c. 23.

Amongſt all the directions given in Scripture for finding out the truth, there is not one word to this purpoſe; and amongſt all the Diſputes in the Primitive Church, we find no ſuch courſe taken for the final determination of them, as the having recourſe to the Apoſtolical Chair of *Rome*. Hereſies were not then ſo ſcarce, nor the confutation of them ſo eaſie, as that this relief ſhould be forgotten. And it ſeems they themſelves did then as little underſtand their own Privileges, as they did the Principles of Faith; for this was never ſo much as thought of, in all thoſe Councils which were called on purpoſe for the ſuppreſſion of Hereſies, and where the Legats of the Pope were preſent: Nay to this very day they are at a loſs where to go for it, whether to the Pope, or a Council, or both, or Tradition, or the Collective Body of Chriſtians; that is, they know not whether to give up the Cauſe or to maintain it. I muſt confeſs, if I ſhould hear a perſon ſolemnly declare, that he hath Treaſure enough in his poſſeſſion to enrich the whole World, and ſhould gravely invite all perſons to addreſs themſelves to him, but in the mean time perceive (though he hath been of the ſame Mind for ſeveral Years,) that he can neither tell where it is, nor is he and his Family for all this the richer, or in a better condition than other Folk, I ſhould vehemently ſuſpect him either to be a notorious Impoſtor, or perfect Lunatick. And when we hear the Church of *Rome* confidently aſſerting its own Infallibility, but find withall that ſhe knows not where to fix it, and that its ruptures and differences are in the mean time as great as in other Churches, and what are never ended by the way it pretends to, but by plain downright force, I cannot for my heart but think there is for the moſt part more of Intereſt than Reaſon in the Caſe, and what they themſelves do rather live by than believe.

But in my mind there is no better Evidence that this is *new*, than that it's falſe; and no better evidence that it is falſe, than that it hath miſtaken. Of which, beſides what hath been, or ſhall be farther ſaid of alterations in that Church, I ſhall give you two plain Inſtances, The Council of *Trent* ‖ ſaith, that *Traditions are to be received with equal reverence as the Scriptures*; and *Maldonat* * tells us, that *The giving the Euchariſt to Children, was a Tradition in the Church for 600 Years after Chriſt*; which is now condemned (as he ſhews) by the Council of *Trent*. Again, S. *Hierom* ‖ ſaith, that *the Latine Church then did not receive the Epiſtle to the* Hebrews *among ſt the Canonical Scriptures*: But that is now taken into the number by them, and required ſo to be under an Anathema, *Seſſ.* 4. *Decr.* 1. *Conc. Trid.* Now Infallibility and Fallibility are contradictory, and if that Church hath erred, (as erred ſhe hath) then ſhe cannot be infallible, and ſo conſequently the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome* was not the Principle of the Primitive Church of *Rome*.

‖ *Seſſ.* 4. *decr.* 1.

* *Com in Joh.* 6. *p* 317.

‖ *In Ia c.* 6. & *c.* 8.

I could ſhew as much of Novelty in the Doctrines of Indulgences, Purgatory, the Maſs's being a Propitiatory Sacrifice, and of no Salvation out of the *Romiſh* Church, *&c.* but what I have ſaid I think is ſufficient.

Secondly, The Alterations are as great in point of Practice; the Church of *Rome* differs therein as much from what ſhe originally was: As,

1. The keeping the Scriptures and publick Service in an unknown Tongue, is new. The firſt is evident from the Tranſlations of the Scripture into ſeveral Languages, and eſpecially into the Latine, (at that time a vulgar Tongue) of which no ſufficient Reaſon can be given, were it not for the uſe of thoſe that underſtood not the Originals. The latter is not onely clear from 1 *Cor.* 14. but what *Bellarmine* * doth acknowledge; who ſaith, *That the cuſtome of the Peoples ſaying* Amen, [that is to what they underſtood,] *as they did in the Apoſtles time*, con-

* *De Verbo Dei, lib.* 2. *cap.* 16.

continued long in the Weſtern as well as Eaſtern Church.

2. Worſhipping of Images, which was firſt eſtabliſhed in the ſecond Council at *Nice*, but is ſo different from and contrary to the practice of the Primitive Church, that *Caſſander* ‖ (an Authour of theirs) ſaith, *that the Chriſtians had not then ſo much as Images in their Churches*; and doth farther declare from *Origen*, that the Ancients *ab omni veneratione* (the very word uſed by the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 25. *decret. de Invocat.*) *imaginum abhorruerunt*, that all Veneration of them was abhorred. To this I refer the worſhipping of Saints, which was ſo little thought of, that many of the Fathers did not think that the Souls of any ſhould enjoy the beatifick Viſion, and be in a ſtate of happineſs till the Reſurrection, as *Stapleton* * doth ſhew. And it ſeems not to have been an Article of Faith in the time either of *Lombard* or *Scotus*, the former of which ſaith ‖ *It's not incredible the Saints do hear what we ſay*; and the latter * that *it's probable God doth reveal our prayers that are offered unto them.* It was then the Doctrine of probability onely, but now all are required to believe it under an Anathema, by the Council of *Trent* ‖.

‖ *Conſult. Artic.* 21. *ſect.* 4.

* *Deſenſ. Eccl. cont.* Whitaker, *l.* 1. *c.* 2. *Tom.* 1. *p.* 868.

‖ *Sent. l.* 4. *diſt.* 45.

* *In* 4. *diſt.* 45. *Q.* 4.

‖ *Seſſ.* 25. *de Invocat.*

As much is to be ſaid concerning the Innovation of Worſhip to the Virgin *Mary*, of which we read nothing in Scripture or Antiquity, unleſs in what was practiſed by the Hereticks, called *Collyridiani* in *Epiphanius* ‖, that uſed to carry about her Image, and offer Cakes and Worſhip to it; with whom that good Father thus encounters: *What Scripture hath delivered any ſuch thing*, &c. *Let* Mary *be in honour, but let the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt be worſhipped; let no man worſhip* Mary.

‖ *Hæreſ.* 79.

3. Communion in one Kind expreſly contrary to the Scripture, and the former practice of the *Romiſh* Church. The former is acknowledged by the Council of *Conſtance* * when they decreed with a *notwithſtanding* for it.

* *Seſſ.* 13.

‖ Artic. 22. The latter is acknowledged by *Caſſander* ‖, who ſaith, *That the* Roman *Church it ſelf retained the practice of receiving in both Kinds, for above one thouſand years after Chriſt, as is evident from innumerable teſtimonies of ancient Writers.*

To theſe I might add the practice of ſaying private and ſolitary Maſſes, of the Adoration of the Hoſt, and carrying it about in Proceſſion, Confeſſion, (as uſed in their Church,) *&c.* But I ſhall forbear.

III. Theſe alterations are to the worſe, and groſs Corruptions. For if the Pope is not Chriſt's Vicar originally, and by his Deputation, then he is ſo far a great Uſurper. If he hath not a Power over Kings, to depoſe them, and abſolve their Subjects from Allegiance to them, then thoſe of them that have uſed that power have been notorious diſturbers of the World. If their Church be not infallible, and can no more penetrate into, or reſolve and determine points of Faith than another, they do deceive and are deceived. If Tranſubſtantiation be a Doctrine of their own, and not of Chriſt's, they uſurp upon his Prerogative. If the Scriptures are free to all, then their Church is guilty of the damnation of all amongſt themſelves, that periſh through the want of knowing and underſtanding them; and of all the ignorance in the Chriſtian World, which proceeds from that cauſe. If worſhipping Images, Saints and Angels, the Hoſt, and Reliques, be not Chriſtian Doctrine, and that theſe are no lawful Objects of ſuch Worſhip, then they are Idolaters. If Chriſtians are obliged to partake of the Wine as well as the Bread in the Lord's Supper, then what are they that deny and forbid it? In fine, they that doe ſuch things are no Friends to the Kingdom of Chriſt and the Chriſtian World.

If all this be true, that a Church may fall from what it once was, and be altered to the worſe, and that theirs is ſo, then we need not ſpend time in diſputing what

Apo-

Apoſtaſie, *Hereſie* and *Schiſm* is, upon which we may talk prettily and ſubtilly; or by which of them that Church is faln, as long as faln ſhe is. But yet to clear the matter of all wrangling Diſputes, I ſhall conſider theſe things alſo; and ſhew,

Secondly, That the particulars are very fallacious; which will appear from the conſideration of the ſeveral Terms.

1. *Moſt pure, excellent, flouriſhing Mother-Church*; of all which little or nothing is ſaid in the places of Scripture quoted by him in the Margin. If we conſult the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, there referred to, we ſhall find, That it was ſo far from being at that time a *flouriſhing Church*, that it is there not once ſo much as called a Church. The Apoſtle directs two Epiſtles to the Church in *Corinth*, and two to the Church of the *Theſſalonians*, and one to the Churches of *Galatia*; but to the *Romans* he writes thus, *Ch.* 1. *v.* 7. *To all that be in* Rome, *beloved of God, called to be Saints*; as if they were yet Converts at large, without any other ſetled Conſtitution, than what was in the Houſe of *Aquila*, which he therefore calls a Church, *Ch.* 16. *v.* 5. And therefore *Salmeron*, aware of it, thinks St. *Paul* would not call them a Church purpoſely, *becauſe of the Factions that were there at that time betwixt the* Jews *and* Gentiles. *Tom.* 13. *in Rom.* 1. *diſp.* 7. *p.* 299. *col.* 2.

But if we ſhould grant it a Church; yet how doth that, *Rom.* 1. 8. prove that it was *flouriſhing*, when it's onely ſaid there, *Your Faith is ſpoken of throughout the whole World*; and *in Ch.* 16. *v.* 19. (for I ſuppoſe that is the other place he would refer to) *Your obedience is come abroad unto all Men*; by which doubtleſs no more is to be underſtood, but that the Converſion of many to Chriſtianity in that City was ſpread throughout the *Roman* World; and did tend much to the propagation of it, as that City was then the Imperial Seat.

This

This is the explication given of this place by ſome of their own Writers, *viz. Rigaltius*, in his Notes upon St. *Cyprian*, *Epiſt. p.* 78. and *Tolet*, who in *c.* 1. *ad Rom. Annot.* 16. call it a true *Expoſition*, and ſaith it's to be underſtood as 1 *Theſ.* 1. 8.

As for the Term *Mother*, I hope he means not that the Goſpel firſt came from thence; for in that ſenſe ſhe was a Daughter, and not a Mother. And if any Church could pretend to any Authority from that conſideration, it muſt be *Jeruſalem*, which in this ſenſe was the *Mother of us all.* But if he means thereby that ſhe was an Original and Apoſtolical Church, planted by the Apoſtles, or in Apoſtolical times (for ſo *Tertullian* uſeth theſe Words alike, *lib. de præſcript. cap.* 21. when he calls them *Matrices & Originales Eccleſiæ*, and again *Eccleſiæ Apoſtolicæ*) then ſuch alſo was *Epheſus* in *Aſia*, and *Corinth* in *Achaia*, &c. as *Tertullian* there ſhews, *c.* 32, and 36. of which Churches it will be hard for him to find any thing remaining, and which, while they did remain, he muſt acknowledge to have faln, and been groſly corrupted. And therefore *Rome*'s being a *Mother* Church, in this ſenſe, is no ſecurity againſt *Apoſtaſie*, *Hereſie* and *Schiſm.*

2. *Apoſtaſie*, he ſaith, *is a renouncing not onely the Faith of Chriſt, but the very Name and Title to Chriſtianity.* This indeed is Apoſtaſie with a Witneſs; but as it is no more than a Branch or particular kind of it, ſo it can be no complete or true definition of it. It being juſt as if he ſhould ſay, that Theft is the violent and forcible taking away of another Man's Goods; which indeed is the higheſt degree of it, and what we uſually call Robbery; but there are other ſorts of Theft beſides; and though it be never ſo ſurreptitiouſly and clandeſtinely done, it is as well Theft, and a breach of the Eighth Commandment as the other. So it is in the preſent caſe; the higheſt degree of Apoſtaſie is a renouncing the very

very name of Chriſtian, the turning a *Renegado*, a *Turk*, or *Jew*: But that is Apoſtaſie alſo, when there is a departure from the Faith of Chriſt, or from any great Article or Articles of it. And ſo far a perſon may be truly an Apoſtate, and yet *retain the Name and Title to Chriſtianity*. I muſt confeſs, I always took thoſe to be Apoſtates, whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. that *depart from the Faith of Chriſt*, who yet ſeem to have continued in the profeſſion of it. And I am apt to believe Antichriſt will be thought an Apoſtate; and yet it's the opinion of many among themſelves, that he ſhall retain the name of Chriſtian. But if this will not doe, I muſt refer him to the *Bulla Cœnæ* of Pope *Paul* the Fifth, where it's ſaid in the firſt Article of it, *Excommunicamus*, &c. *We excommunicate and anathematiſe*, &c. *all* Huſſites, Wickleviſts, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calviniſts, Hugonots, Anabaptiſts, Trinitarians, *& à Chriſtiana fide Apoſtatas, ac omnes & ſingulos alios Hæreticos*, &c. *and all Apoſtates from the Chriſtian Faith, and all other Hereticks*, &c. which is doubtleſs ſpoken of ſuch as have not, nor are ſuppoſed to have renounced the Name and Title to Chriſtianity. So that either the Pope in one of his moſt ſolemn Bulls is miſtaken, or this Gentleman: And if we take to the former, as I hope he either in modeſty, or for a more important reaſon which he is privy to, will allow, then the Church of *Rome* may be faln by Apoſtaſie, though ſhe doth retain the Name and Title, and will needs be the onely Church of Chriſt.

3. *Hereſie*, he ſaith, *is an adheſion to ſome private or ſingular Opinion or Errour in Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Church*. Before we admit this Definition, there are a great many things to be conſidered; as firſt, that the relation which he makes Hereſie to have to the Doctrine of the Church, is not current

current amongſt themſelves. For many of them do ſay, that Hereſie is *Nihil aliud quàm Error in rebus fidei cum pertinacia*, *Hereſie is nothing elſe than an Errour in the matters of Faith with obſtinacy*, as *Sayrus* acknowledgeth in his *Clavis Sacerdotum*, *l.* 2. *c.* 9. *n.* 34. and *Durand* is of the ſame mind (notwithſtanding what *Sayrus* ſaith of him to the contrary) as appears *l.* 4. *diſt.* 13. *Q.* 5. where he makes the reſpect which Hereſie hath to the Church, to be *becauſe the Church is conſtituted*, *per unitatem fidei*, *by the unity of the Faith*: So that according to theſe, the reſpect which Hereſie hath to the Church, is onely from the reſpect which the Church hath to the Faith: And to find out what Hereſie is, we muſt enquire not what the Church is, but what is the Faith. And if ſo, a Church, even that of *Rome*, may fall by Hereſie, though ſhe may hold the general approved Doctrine of the Church. But I doubt, if we ſhould admit the whole, and yet take it in any ſenſe but one, *viz.* for the general approved Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* in the laſt Ages of it, that we ſhall find her guilty in this point alſo. Shall the Church be taken for the primitive Church three or four hundred years after our Saviour, then they are guilty of Hereſie who will have the Pope to be Chriſt's Vicar, and to have Juriſdiction over all Churches; that do maintain worſhipping of Images, Angels and Saints, to be lawful and neceſſary, *&c.* contrary to the general approved Doctrine of thoſe Ages. Should we take the Church for the Church Catholick in any Age (as *Caſſander* doth, *Conſult. Artic.* 22.) that is, the Congregation of Chriſt's faithful people all over the World, then ſtill *Rome* would fall into the ſame condemnation, ſince that ſhe is but a little part in compariſon of the whole. Should we take *Church* again for the *Romiſh* Church in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, it would then alſo condemn it ſelf, as I have

have before ſhewed. And I ſee no way for them, even according to this definition, (which is perfectly one of their own making) to avoid this imputation, but by ſtifly maintaining, that they thereby underſtand the Church of *Rome* for ſome Ages laſt paſt; if that will doe; and then we know where to find them, and what to underſtand when they talk of the Church.

4. *Schiſm*, he ſaith, *is a departure from the Unity of the Church whereby the Band and Communion held with ſome former Church is broken.* This is as lame and fallacious a definition as any of the reſt. For by foiſting in that word *Former*, which he after runs upon, he reſtrains it to one particular Branch of Schiſm; and it's juſt as if he ſhould ſay, *A Church is an Aſſembly of Chriſtians that join in Communion with each other in the City of* Rome; which none will allow to be a ſufficient definition of a Church: For that term added, *In the City of* Rome, doth no more than prove that the Aſſembly of Chriſtians there met is a Church; but is no definition of a Church; for then no Church could be out of the City of *Rome*, and every Church, if it be a Church, muſt be in that City, and no where elſe, if that be a true definition of it. So it is here, the word *Former* added to the definition of Schiſm here given, doth prove no more than that a departure from the Unity of a Former Church is a *ſpecies* and ſort of Schiſm, but is no adequate definition of it. For if it is, then no Church can be guilty of Schiſm, that doth, how unwarrantably ſoever, refuſe to hold Communion with, or doth break off from the Communion of a Church that was not a Church before it. And conſequently, though the Church of *Jeruſalem* had denied to hold Communion with any Church whatſoever, (though it were even with the Church of *Rome* it ſelf,) ſhe could not be guilty of Schiſm, becauſe ſhe was the firſt Church, and

none was prior to her. And we alſo ſhould be quit of that blame (if we had nothing elſe to ſay for our ſelves) foraſmuch as a Church was founded here in *Britain* two years before that of *Antioch*; and St. *Peter* was ſeven years at *Antioch* before he preſided at *Rome*, as *Baronius* ſaith, *An.* 35. *Num.* 5. and *An.* 39. *Numb.* 23. from whom, and from which time they pretend alone to derive their Supremacy.

And now this will hold, although the Church thus ſeparated from had given no reaſon or colour at all for it. For according to the definition of our Authour, it muſt be a *Former Church* which the departure muſt be from to make it Schiſm. We may indeed ſay, that Schiſm is when the Band or Communion held with any Church, is (without juſt reaſon) broken and diſſolved; becauſe all Chriſtian Churches ought to maintain Communion with each other, where it may be had: But if ſo, then the Church of *Rome* is the moſt Schiſmatical in the World, that denies Communion with all Churches that are not in all *Tridentine* points one with her.

If you now, Sir, reflect upon his Scheme and frame of Arguments, you will ſee that they hold in nothing which he produceth them for.

For what will it ſignifie, if it be granted that the Church of *Rome* was once a moſt pure, flouriſhing Church, if ſhe be now abominably corrupted? What if ſhe was a Mother-Church planted by the Apoſtles, and watered with their Doctrine, and their Bloud, when ſhe now preacheth another Doctrine than ſhe was taught by them, and hath groſly corrupted that Faith which they did there eſtabliſh? What if ſhe was a Mother-Church to ſome other Churches, yet, that as it gives her no Authority over thoſe whom ſhe was not in any ſenſe a Mother to, ſo even not over ſuch as ſhe might pretend that Relation to, when ſhe is now not

to

to be approached to, or held Communion with, without apparent hazard of Salvation; and is faln from thoſe Principles and that Faith which ſhe at their firſt converſion inſtructed them in? When ſhe is faln by Apoſtaſie, Hereſie and Schiſm.

By Apoſtaſie, as ſhe hath forſaken the Primitive Church, and is not now what ſhe originally was, either in Faith or Manners.

By Hereſie, as ſhe hath received new Articles of Faith, that were not ſuch before; and ſo obſtinately perſiſted therein, that ſhe hath turned the Anathema upon all Diſſenters in thoſe points from her. Such Articles ſhe hath embraced, and doth now hold, as have been *condemned by Councils, wrote againſt by Fathers, and reproved by Authority.*

Some of theſe ſhe was particularly charged with, and reproved for; and in others ſhe is as much concerned, as if particularly charged, becauſe ſhe hath embraced thoſe things which were by them condemned. For if the things and principles were condemned, whoever holds them is as much ſo condemned by that Authority, as if particularly named. As they will acknowledge, that if a Church now in Communion with them ſhould fall off from them, ſhe is thereby as much under the *Anathema* of the Council of *Trent*, as if ſhe had at the meeting of that Council been ſo far faulty, and thereby been particularly condemned.

By Schiſm ſhe is faln, as ſhe denies Communion with all other Churches in the World, whether they were ſo before ſhe was a Church, or were Churches converted and eſtabliſhed at the ſame time with her, or that have embraced the Chriſtian Faith ſince ſhe did. The company of ſuch ſhe hath left: From theſe Bodies ſhe is gone forth: And theſe were the true Churches which ſhe forſook. So that ſhe will be found as often guilty of

Apo-

Apoſtaſie, as there are particulars of Faith, Doctrine, Worſhip and Manners, which ſhe is fallen from the Primitive Church in. As often of Hereſie, as ſhe hath new Principles of Faith, and which the Church was not then acquainted with. As often of Schiſm, as there are Churches in the World, that ſhe will not hold Communion with, onely becauſe they will not embrace thoſe Principles, or join with her in thoſe practices which ſhe holds contrary to them, and with them to the Primitive Church.

And thus, Sir, I have made good, I hope, what I firſt undertook, and if thereby any ſervice can be done to you or our Religion, it will be a great ſatisfaction to,

SIR,

Your Servant.

FINIS.